

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/815,257	03/22/2001	Yutaka Kamezaki	55521 (70904)	6515	
21874 75	90 01/24/2005		EXAMINER		
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP			NGUYEN, CHANH DUY		
P.O. BOX 5587 BOSTON, MA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			2675		
			DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005	DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\mathcal{N}				_			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany		09/815,257	KAMEZAKI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	TI MANUNO DATE OF MICE	Chanh Nguyen	2675				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
THE M Extensi after SI - If the po - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT Ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (x (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by ly received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Notes a statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BARANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ F	desponsive to communication(s) filed on	02 September 2004.					
2a)⊠ T	his action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4a 5)⊠ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are with a laim(s) <u>1-23 and 27-42</u> is/are allowed. claim(s) <u>24-26, 43-58</u> is/are rejected. claim(s) is/are objected to. claim(s) are subject to restriction is	thdrawn from consideration.					
Applicatio	n Papers						
9) <u></u> ⊤I	ne specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.					
10)∐ TI	ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[☐ accepted or b)☐ objected	to by the Examiner.				
	pplicant may not request that any objection	Ŧ · ·	, ,				
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the cone oath or declaration is objected to by t	·	• , ,).			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	cknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docu Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E	iments have been received. iments have been received in e priority documents have be Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachmant/-	a.	•					
Attachment(s	f) of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice (3) Information	of Neighburg Cities (170-092) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/94) lo(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper N	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Patent and Trad	amod Office			_			

Art Unit: 2675

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on September 02, 2004 has been entered and considered by examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: Although applicant claim 29 meet the requirement of 112/2nd,i.e. the metes and bound are determinable, the spelling could be improved. Example is the word "potion" recited in claim 29, line 7 should be changed to the word "portion". It is in the best interest of the patent community that applicant, in his/her normal review and/or rewriting of the claim, to take into consideration these editorial situation and make changes as necessary.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 44-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 44 and 54 recite the limitation "the transition instruction signal" in line 17 (claim 44) and line 19 (claim 54). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 09/815,257 Page 3

Art Unit: 2675

Claims 45-53 and 55-58 are rejected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Osamu et al (JP 2585463).

As to claim 43, Osamu discloses a driving method of a display device (1) which output display scanning signal (Figure 6, signals indicated as Y1-Y480) respectively to scanning signal lines (21), and outputting display data signal (SIG) respect to data signal data lines (11) so as to display an image which is in accordance with the display data with respect to pixels (61) which are disposed on a matrix having a partial display function for a non-image area (23, 25) and an image display area (22), horizontal signal lines in a vertical period of the display device (i.e. data lines X1- Xn = 640 lines) being greater than the scanning lines (Y1-Yn = 480 lines). Osamu teaches the display scanning signals (Y1-Y40 and Y441-Y480) and the display data signals (SIG 81) simultaneously outputted with respect to the respect to scanning lines and respective data signal lines which correspond to the non image area (23, 25); see Figure 6.

Application/Control Number: 09/815,257 Page 4

Art Unit: 2675

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 9. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osamu et al (JP 2585463) in view of Taku (JP11-184434).

As to claim 24, Osamu discloses a driving method of a display device (1) which output display scanning signal (Figure 6, signals indicated as Y1-Y480) respectively to scanning signal lines (21), and outputting display data signal (SIG) respect to data signal data lines (11) so as to display an image which is in accordance with the display data with respect to pixels (61) which are disposed on a matrix having a partial display function for a non-image area (23, 25) and an image display area (22). Osamu teaches the step of distinguish a predetermined image display area (22) and a predetermined

Art Unit: 2675

non-image area (23, 25) (i.e. display signal and non-display signal for distinguishing image display are and non- image area). Osamu teaches the display scanning signals (Y1-Y40 and Y441-Y480) and the display data signals (SIG 81) simultaneously outputted with respect to the respect to scanning lines and respective data signal lines which correspond to the non image area (23, 25); see Figure 6. Osamu does not mention a step of deactivating operation of the scanning signal line driving section until next display being carried. Taku teaches that "after the F2 period, the application of the CLY corresponding to the non-display portion is stopped and the output of the select voltage from the Y driver is prevented" (see paragraph 0043). This read on the limitation "following the simultaneously outputting, deactivating operation of the scanning line driving section" as recited in the claim. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the step of deactivating operation of scanning line driving section as taught by Taku to the scanning line driving section of Osamu so as tor reduce the poser consumption (see paragraph 0002 of Taku).

Page 5

horizontal periods are clearly taught by Osamu as shown in figure 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 10. Claims 1-23, 27-33, 34-42 are allowed.
- 11. Claims 44-58 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed September 02, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claim 43, on page 32, first paragraph, applicant argues that "Osamu does not consider suspending operation to decrease power consumption. Power consumption is proportional to the rate of the operating period and the non-operating periods. Therefore, even if the operation is suspended only in the flyback periods there would be no reduction in consumption when the flyback period is longer than the effective display period". However, claim 43 does not recite the limitation "suspending operation to decrease power consumption" as applicant's argument. Thus, while Osamu's device may differ from applicant disclosed device, it reads on broad claimed language.

As to claims 24-26, on page 35, second paragraph, applicant argues that "Basically, Applicants describe a condition where logic elements or functionalities of the scanning signal line driving section are shutdown or turned off so as to reduce power consumption and to be incapable of providing output signals until the driving section is turned on when the next display is to be carried out". However, claim 24 does not recite the limitation "scanning signal line driving section are shutdown or turned off so as to reduce power consumption and to be incapable of providing output signals until the driving section is turned on when the next display is to be carried out". The claimed "deactivated" is so broad that it reads on the output signal from the scanning driver circuit (Y driver) being prevented from outputting. If the output signal is being prevented

Art Unit: 2675

from the scanning driver circuit (Y driver), then electronic components in the driving circuit stop performing the function or deactivated. For example, switches in the driving circuit from ON position (or activated) must be switched to OFF position (or deactivated) so that signal cannot be outputted.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6603. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2675

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. Nguyen January 21, 2005 Chanh Nguyen Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2675